

1 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. (SBN 112279)
2 fzimmer@kslaw.com
3 CHERYL A. SABNIS (SBN 224323)
4 csabnis@kslaw.com
5 KING & SPALDING LLP
6 101 Second Street – Suite 2300
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
8 Telephone: (415) 318-1200
9 Facsimile: (415) 318-1300
10 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
11 sweingaertner@kslaw.com
12 ROBERT F. PERRY
13 rperry@kslaw.com
14 BRUCE W. BABER (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
15 bbaber@kslaw.com
16 KING & SPALDING LLP
17 1185 Avenue of the Americas
18 New York, NY 10036-4003
19 Telephone: (212) 556-2100
20 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222
21 Attorneys for Defendant
22 GOOGLE INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18
19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

21 Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

22 Plaintiff,

23 Honorable Judge William H. Alsup

24 v.

25 GOOGLE INC.’S RESPONSE TO THE
26 COURT’S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

27 GOOGLE INC.

28 Defendant.

RESPONSE TO SHOW CAUSE ORDER

2 On October 28, 2010, the Court ordered Google Inc. to show cause why its pending
3 motion to dismiss count VIII of plaintiff's complaint or, in the alternative, for a more definite
4 statement, filed on October 4, is not moot in view of Oracle America Inc.'s recently-filed
5 Amended Complaint For Patent And Copyright Infringement. Because Oracle's Amended
6 Complaint effectively concedes the merits of Google's motion to dismiss and supersedes the
7 original complaint, Google agrees with the Court's suggestion that the filing of the Amended
8 Complaint renders moot the specific issues raised in Google's motion. Google therefore agrees
9 that its Motion To Dismiss should be denied as moot, without prejudice to Google's right to file
10 a new motion to address issues raised by Oracle's Amended Complaint.

11 In the spirit of proceeding as efficiently as possible through the early stages of this case,
12 Google notes that Oracle’s filing of the Amended Complaint will require Google to file a new
13 answer (to the Amended Complaint) and counterclaims, which will replace Google’s original
14 Answer And Counterclaims, filed on October 4, and will become Google’s operative pleading.
15 Accordingly, Google believes that Oracle’s pending motion to dismiss and to strike, filed on
16 October 26, is also moot, or will necessarily become so once Google files its answer to the
17 Amended Complaint. Oracle’s motion is directed to Google’s answer to Oracle’s original
18 complaint and its counterclaims asserted in response to the original complaint, which will in the
19 near future be superseded by a further pleading. Thus, as Oracle argued in opposition to
20 Google’s motion to dismiss, Oracle’s motion to dismiss and to strike should also be denied on
21 the grounds that it will be moot once Google responds to the Amended Complaint.

22 | //

23 | //

24 | //

25 | //

26 | //

27 | //

28

1 Dated: November 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

2
3
4 KING & SPALDING LLP

5
6
7 By: /s/ Scott T. Weingaertner /s/

8 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
9 sweingaertner@kslaw.com
10 ROBERT F. PERRY
11 rperry@kslaw.com
12 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
13 bbaber@kslaw.com
14 KING & SPALDING LLP
15 1185 Avenue of the Americas
16 New York, NY 10036-4003
17 Telephone: (212) 556-2100
18 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

19
20 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. (SBN 112279)
21 fzimmer@kslaw.com
22 CHERYL A. SABNIS (SBN 224323)
23 csabnis@kslaw.com
24 KING & SPALDING LLP
25 101 Second Street – Suite 2300
26 San Francisco, CA 94105
27 Telephone: (415) 318-1200
28 Facsimile: (415) 318-1300

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
GOOGLE INC.

I, Donald F. Zimmer, Jr., as the ECF user and filer of this document, attest that
concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatory.

Dated: November 1, 2010

By: /s/ Donald F. Zimmer, Jr. /s/

For Defendant GOOGLE INC.